arXiv:quant-ph/9808033v1 19 Aug 1998

Continuous quantum measurements of a particle in a Paul trap.

A. Camacho ° * and A. Camacho–Galván ◇†
◇DEP–Facultad de Ingeniería,
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,
°Physics Department,
Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa.
P. O. Box 55-534, 09340, México, D.F., México.

Abstract

We calculate the propagator of a particle caught in a Paul trap and subject to the continuous quantum measurement of its position. The probabilities of the measurement outputs, the possible trajectories of the particle, are also found. This enables us to propose a series of experiments that would allow to confront the predictions of one of the models that describe the interaction between a measured quantum system and measuring device, namely the so called Restricted Path-Integral Formalism, with the experiment.

1 Introduction.

The interest that the quantum theory of measurements has gendered among physicists appeared simultaneously with the inception of quantum theory. Between 1940 and 1980 the technology was not capable of making a repetitive measurement on a single quantum mechanical system. The feasible experiments in those years comprised an ensemble of single measurements on a large number of quantum systems, and the consequence of a measurement was the destruction of the employed quantum system. A deep understanding of the principles of quantum mechanics can not be achieved without a profound comprehension of quantum measurements.

*email: abel@abaco.uam.mx
†email: abel@servidor.unam.mx

Nevertheless, now we have the possibility of making repetitive measurements on a single quantum system. For instance, it is possible [1] to confine and observe an individual electron in a Penning trap, or we can now also have a trapped single atom and observe its interaction with a radiation field, for example by means of a laser fluorescence [2]. In the case of the so called Paul trap, which has led to the construction of a mass spectrometer [3], a ion is trapped employing a high-frequency electric quadrupole field [4]. As is known, this idea can also be extended to the case of neutral atoms, laser cooled and stopped atoms are confined in a magnetic quadrupole trap formed by two opposed, separated, coaxial current loops [5].

The aforementioned experiments open the possibility of confronting the theoretical predictions of some formalisms that pretend to describe the interaction between measuring apparatus and measured system against experimental results.

One of these formalisms is the so called Restricted Path–Integral Formalism (RPIF) [6]. The main idea in this approach is the restriction by means of a weight functional of the integration domain of the path–integral that renders the corresponding propagator of the analyzed system, when one or more of its parameters are subject to a continuous measurement process.

Let us explain this point a little bit better, and suppose that we have a particle which has a one–dimensional movement. The amplitude $A(q'', q')$ for this particle to move from the point q' to the point q'' is called propagator. It is given by Feynman [7]

$$A(q'', q') = \int d[q] exp(\frac{i}{\hbar} S[q]), \tag{1}$$

here we must integrate over all the possible trajectories $q(t)$ and $S[q]$ is the action of the system, which is defined as

$$S[q] = \int_{t'}^{t''} dt L(q, \dot{q}). \tag{2}$$

Let us now suppose that we perform a continuous measurement of the position of this particle, such that we obtain as result of this measurement process a certain output $a(t)$. In other words, the measurement process gives the value $a(t)$ for the coordinate $q(t)$ at each time t, and this output has associated a certain error Δa, which is determined by the experimental resolution of the measuring device. The amplitude $A_{[a]}(q'', q')$ can be now thought of as a probability amplitude for the continuous measurement process to give the result $a(t)$. Taking the square modulus of this amplitude allows us to find the probability density for different measurement outputs.

Clearly, the integration in the Feynman path–integral should be restricted to those trajectories that match with the experimental output. RPIF says that this condition can be introduced by means of a weight functional $\omega_a[q]$ [8]. This means that expression (1) becomes now under a continuous measurement process

$$A_a = \int d[q]\omega_a[q]exp(iS[q]). \tag{3}$$

The more probable the trajectory $[q]$ is, according to the output a, the bigger that $\omega_a[q]$ becomes [6], this means that the value of $\omega_a[q]$ is approximately one for all trajectories $[q]$ that agree with the measurement output a and it is almost 0 for those that do not match with the result of the experiment.

Clearly, the weight functional contains all the information about the interaction between measuring device and measured system, and the problems that in this context appear are two:

(i) The concrete form of the weight functional $\omega_{[q]}$ depends on the measuring device [9], in other words, the involved experimental constructions determine these weight functionals. We must determine $\omega_{[a]}[q]$ starting from the knowledge that we have of the measuring device, a non trivial problem.

(ii) If we wish an analytical expression for A_a, then the resulting weight functional must render an analytically handleable functional integral.

The aforementioned formalism has been used to analyze several measuring processes, for instance, the measurability of an electromagnetic field [10], the response of a gravitational wave antenna of Weber type [6], the analysis of the measuring process of a gravitational wave in a laser–interferometer detector [11], and even to explain the appearence of some classical properties, like the concept of time, in quantum cosmology [12].

Even though there are already some works [13] that give the possibility of checking the predictions of RPIF against the experiment, it seems that we still need a better understanding of this point. In this context, the case of an electrically charged particle caught in a Paul trap [4] is an experiment which can be performed and in consequence yields a framework which may be used to check predictions of RPIF. More precise, in this work we evaluate (using RPIF) the propagator of a harmonic oscillator with a time dependent frequency, and which is subject to the continuous measurement of its position. The probability of any measurement output, the possible trajectories, is also found. In other words, we apply RPIF to the case in which we measure continuously the position of a particle caught in a Paul trap.

2 Propagator of a particle in a Paul trap.

In order to obtain a confrontation with the experiment of the predictions of RPIF we consider the case of a particle caught in a Paul trap. It is already known that, in this case we have a harmonic oscillator having a frequency equal to $\bar{U} - \bar{V}cos(\omega t)$, being $\bar{U}$, $\bar{V}$, and ω constants which depend on the electric quadrupole field used to trap the particle. The motion equations of an electrically charged particle caught in a Paul trap are given by [4] (here we will assume that ions are injected in the y–direction and that there is electric field only along the x– and z–coordinates)

$$\ddot{x}(t) + \frac{e}{mr^2}[\bar{U} - \bar{V}cos(\omega t)]x(t) = 0, \tag{4}$$

$$\ddot{z}(t) - \frac{e}{mr^2}[\bar{U} - \bar{V}cos(\omega t)]z(t) = 0. \tag{5}$$

here e is the electric charge of the particle, m its mass and $2r$ the distance between the electrodes that conform part of the experimental apparatus. The solutions to these equations are the so called Mathieu functions [14].

Let us now first consider the motion only along the x–axis. This is no restriction at all, because the complete motion can be separated in two independent motions. Thus, our starting point is the following Lagrangian

$$L = \frac{1}{2}m\dot{x}^2(t) - \frac{1}{2}m[U - Vcos(\omega t)]x^2(t). \tag{6}$$

here we have introduced the following definitions: $U = \frac{e}{mr^2}\bar{U}$ and $V = \frac{e}{mr^2}\bar{V}$. The propagator of this particle is then

$$U(x'', t''; x', t) = \int_{x'}^{x''} d[x(t)]exp\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{t'}^{t''}\{\frac{1}{2}m\dot{x}^2(t) - \frac{1}{2}m[U - Vcos(\omega t)]x^2(t)\}dt\}. \tag{7}$$

The complete propagator will be the product of expression (7) and the corresponding propagator along the z–axis, but for simplicity, at this point, we take only the motion along the x–coordinate. Later we will consider the whole motion. Expression (7) is valid, if and only if, no measuring process is present. Let us now suppose that we perform a continuous monitoring of the position of this particle. Then, according to RPIF, we must introduce a weight functional, and the difficulty here comprises the choice of this functional. As was mentioned above, the concrete form of the weight functional $\omega_{[a]}[q]$ depends on the measuring device [9], thus, the involved experimental

constructions determine these weight functionals. At this point we introduce an additional assumption, our choice is

$$\omega_{[a]}[x] = exp\{-\frac{2}{T\Delta a^2}\int_{t'}^{t''}[x(t) - a(t)]^2 dt\}, \tag{8}$$

here $T = t'' - t'$, and Δa is the error in the position measurement, which is determined by the resolution of the measuring apparatus.

Thus, the propagator of a particle in a Paul trap and subject to the measuring of its x–coordinate becomes

$$U_{[a]}(x'', t''; x', t) = \int_{x'}^{x''} d[x] exp\{-\frac{2}{T\Delta a^2}\int_{t'}^{t''}[x(t) - a(t)]^2 dt\} \times \\ exp\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{t'}^{t''}\{\frac{1}{2}m\dot{x}^2(t) - \frac{1}{2}m[U - Vcos(\omega t)]x^2(t)\}dt\}. \tag{9}$$

This propagator can be re–written as follows

$$U_{[a]}(x'', t''; x', t) = exp\{-\frac{2}{T\Delta a^2}\int_{t'}^{t''} a^2(t)dt\} \times \\ \int_{x'}^{x''} d[x] exp\{\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{t'}^{t''}\{\frac{1}{2}m\dot{x}^2(t) - \frac{1}{2}m\tilde{w}^2(t)x^2(t) + F(t)x(t)\}dt\}. \tag{10}$$

Here we have that $\tilde{w}^2(t) = U - 2Vcos(\omega t) + 4\frac{\hbar}{imT\Delta a^2}$ and $F(t) = 4\frac{\hbar}{iT\Delta a^2}a(t)$. From now on we will write $\tilde{U} = U + 4\frac{\hbar}{imT\Delta a^2}$. In other words, the measuring process allows us to define an effective Lagrangian $L_{eff.}$ as follows

$$L_{eff.} = \frac{1}{2}m\dot{x}^2(t) - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{w}^2(t)x^2(t) + F(t)x(t). \tag{11}$$

Let us now denote by $q(t)$ the solution to the classical equations of motion, namely, $m\ddot{q}(t) + m\tilde{w}^2(t)q(t) = F(t)$, and let us write $x(t) = q(t) + \eta(t)$, here $\eta(t') = \eta(t'') = 0$. These two last conditions have to be imposed because we have that $q(t') = x'$ and $q(t'') = x''$. Therefore, the propagator becomes

$$U_{[a]}(x'', t''; x', t) = exp\{\frac{i}{\hbar}S_{cl.} - \frac{2}{T\Delta a^2}\int_{t'}^{t''} a^2(t)dt\} \times \\ \int_{0}^{0} d[\eta(t)] exp\{\frac{im}{2\hbar}\int_{t'}^{t''}[\dot{\eta}^2(t) - \tilde{w}^2(t)\eta^2(t)]dt\}, \tag{12}$$

here $S_{cl.}$ denotes the corresponding classical action of the system.

But we know [15] that

$$\int_0^0 d[\eta(t)]exp\{\frac{im}{2\hbar}\int_{t'}^{t''}[\dot{\eta}^2(t)-\tilde{w}^2(t)\eta^2(t)]dt\} = \sqrt{\frac{m}{2i\pi\hbar f(t'')f(t')\int_{t'}^{t''}f^{-2}(t)dt}}, \quad (13)$$

where $f(t)$ is a solution to the following differential equation

$$[\frac{d^2}{dt^2}+\tilde{w}^2(t)]\psi(t)=0, \quad (14)$$

and satisfying also the condition $\psi(t''), \psi(t') \neq 0$.

Let us now define the following dimensionless parameters $\tilde{t}=\frac{\omega t}{2}$, $p=\frac{4\tilde{U}}{\omega^2}$, and $q=\frac{2V}{\omega^2}$. Hence, expression (14) becomes now

$$\frac{d^2\psi(\tilde{t})}{d\tilde{t}^2}+[p-2qcos(2\tilde{t})]\psi(\tilde{t})=0. \quad (15)$$

In our particular case, we have that the solutions to this last equation are the so called Mathieu functions [14] (which in general are a series).

We may choose [14] the following function as solution to (15)

$$f(\tilde{t}) = cos(\tilde{t}) + \frac{p-1-q}{q}cos(3\tilde{t}) + \frac{(p-9)(p-1-q)-q^2}{q^2}cos(5\tilde{t}) + \frac{(p-25)[(p-9)(p-1-q)-q^2]}{q^3}cos(7\tilde{t}) + ... \quad (16)$$

In order to calculate an approximated expression for our propagator we will truncate the Mathieu function as follows

$$cos(\tilde{t})+\alpha cos(3\tilde{t}) = cos(\frac{\omega t}{2})+\alpha cos(3\frac{\omega t}{2}), \quad (17)$$

where we have introduced the following definition $\alpha=\frac{p-1-q}{q}$. We may take without any problem more terms, but for the sake of brevity we consider only two.

We may now write the propagator of a particle in a Paul trap, whose x–position is continuously measured

$$U_{[a]}(x'',t'';x',t) = exp\{\frac{i}{\hbar}S_{cl.}-\frac{2}{T\Delta a^2}\int_{t'}^{t''}a^2(t)dt\}\times \quad (18)$$

$$
\sqrt{(3\,\alpha-1)(3\,\alpha^2+2\,\alpha-1)\frac{\omega m}{8\pi\alpha\hbar}}
$$

$$
\times\left[\left(-4\ \arctan(\frac{2\,e^{\omega\,it''}\alpha+1-\alpha}{\sqrt{3\,\alpha^2-1+2\,\alpha}})+4\ \arctan(\frac{2\,e^{\omega\,it'}\alpha+1-\alpha}{\sqrt{3\,\alpha^2-1+2\,\alpha}})\right)\times\right.
$$

$$
\frac{1}{\sqrt{3\,\alpha^2-i+2\,\alpha}}+\frac{(\alpha+1)\left(-e^{\omega\,it'}+e^{\omega\,it''}\right)}{(e^{\omega\,it''}+1)\,\alpha\,(e^{\omega\,it'}+1)}
$$

$$
+\frac{\left(e^{\omega\,it''+2\omega\,it'}-2\,e^{2\omega\,it'}+e^{\omega\,it'}-e^{\omega\,it''}-e^{\omega\,it'+2\omega\,it''}+2\,e^{2\omega\,it''}\right)\alpha^2}{(-\alpha e^{2\omega\,it''}-e^{\omega\,it''}+e^{\omega\,it''}\alpha-\alpha)\,(-\alpha e^{2\omega\,it'}-e^{\omega\,it'}+e^{\omega\,it'}\alpha-\alpha)}
$$

$$
\left.+\frac{\left(-e^{\omega\,it''+2\omega\,it'}+e^{\omega\,it''}+e^{\omega\,it'+2\omega\,it''}-e^{\omega\,it'}\right)\alpha}{(-\alpha e^{2\omega\,it''}-e^{\omega\,it''}+e^{\omega\,it''}\alpha-\alpha)\,(-\alpha e^{2\omega\,it'}-e^{\omega\,it'}+e^{\omega\,it'}\alpha-\alpha)}\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}\times
$$

$$
\times\left[\frac{\left(e^{3/2\omega\,it'+3\omega\,it''}+e^{3/2\omega\,it'}-e^{3/2\omega\,it''+3\omega\,it'}-e^{3/2\omega\,it''}\right)e^{-3/2\omega\,it''-3/2\omega\,it'}\alpha}{2}\right.
$$

$$
\left.+\frac{\left(e^{3/2\omega\,it'+2\omega\,it''}+e^{3/2\omega\,it'+\omega\,it''}-e^{3/2\omega\,it''+2\omega\,it'}-e^{3/2\omega\,it''+\omega\,it'}\right)e^{-3/2\omega\,it''-3/2\omega\,it'}}{2}\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}.
$$

3 Probabilities and conclusions.

The probability associated to a measurement process along the x–axis, which gives as measurement output for the $x(t)$–position of the particle the function $a(t)$ is given by the following expression

$$
P_{[a]}=|U_{[a]}(x'',t'';x',t)|^2. \tag{19}
$$

Looking at expressions (4) and (5), it is readily seen that the probability $P_{[b]}$ of obtaining a function $b(t)$ as result of the continuous measurement of the z–coordinate of our particle is given by

$$
P_{[b]}=|U_{[b]}(z'',t'';z',t)|^2, \tag{20}
$$

where the expression that corresponds to this case has the same form as expression (18), with the following four modifications: (i) α becomes $\beta=\frac{\hat{p}-1-\hat{q}}{\hat{q}}$; (ii) $\tilde{U}$ has to be substituted with $\hat{U}=-U+4\frac{\hbar}{imT\Delta b^2}$; (iii) p is now $\hat{p}=\frac{4\hat{U}}{\omega^2}$ and finally; (iv) q becomes $\hat{q}=-\frac{2V}{\omega^2}$.

Thus, the probability of having as a measurement output a function $a(t)$ for the x–coordinate and a function $b(t)$ for the z–coordinate is then given by

$$P_{[a,b]} = P_{[a]} \cdot P_{[b]}. \tag{21}$$

This is the expression we were looking for, and it gives us the opportunity to confront the predictions of RPIF against the experiment. A concrete experimental case that yields this possibility appears in connection with the coordinate monitoring of an individual barium ion [2]. Here, one of the possible choices, for the set of involved experimental parameters, is the following one [4, 17]: $m = 2.28\times 10^{-25}$ kg, $\Delta a = 2\mu$m, $r = 8$ mm, $\bar{U} = 10$ volts, $\bar{V} = 10^2$ volts, $\omega = 2$ MHz and finally, the measuring process lasts $T = 30$ seconds. These parameters mean that in expression (18) we must introduce the identification $\alpha = -(2.62 + i2.81 \times 10^{-11})$. The corresponding definition in the case of movement along the z–axis is $\beta = -(1.02 + i2.81 \times 10^{-11})$.

To conclude, we must mention that we have used expression (8) as the description for the interaction between measuring device and the particle's coordinate. Of course, that we do not expect to have a so simple expression for this interaction. Therefore, we must consider (8) as an approximation of the corresponding interaction, and thus we must take (18) also as approximated result of the correct one.

Nevertheless, there are three reasons that justify the introduction of expression (8):

(i) In the first case when RPIF was applied, Heaveside functions were used to form the weight functional [8]. Afterwards, the same system, but with the introduction of a gaussian weight functional, was analyzed [16]. Both calculations gave the same results up to the order of magnitude.

(ii) We would like to obtain an analytical expression for the probability (in order to have, at least as a first approximation, theoretical predictions that could be confronted with some proposed experiments), and our weight functional renders a gaussian path–integral, which can be easily calculated.

(iii) It has already been pointed out that the concrete form of the weight factor depends on the chosen experimental realization for the measurement process. Nevertheless, if the measurement process is realized as a series of repeated short interactions of the measuring device with a subsidiary system (meter), the gaussian form of the weight functional will arise automatically [18]. Thus, it is preferable, not only mathematically but also physically, to choose this gaussian as weight factor.

The first argument not only justifies our choice, expression (8), but at the same time tells us that our result could be correct, in some experimental situations, only up to the order of magnitude of the considered effects. The third remark means that our choice (a gaussian weight functional) renders, under certain experimental condi-

tions, the exact description of the interaction between measuring device and measured system. To resume, our choice is in some particular experimental constructions the exact weight functional and in the remaining cases it could give us, up to the order of magnitude of the considered effects, the correct results.

Of course that a more accurate description of this interaction, measuring device–measured system, is needed, but we should then take expression (18) only as a first approximation of our problem, which could allow us to confront the order of magnitude of the predictions of RPIF against the experiment. In order to obtain a more realistic picture we must analyze how the weight functional is defined by the measuring apparatus.

Acknowledgments.

This work was partially supported by CONACYT Grant No. 3544–E9311. A. C. would also like to thank A. Macías for the fruitful discussions on the subject and M. Mensky, not only for mentioning his results before their publication but also for contributing with many suggestions during the preparation of this paper.

References

[1] D. J. Wineland, P. Ekstrom, and H. Dehmelt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **31**, 1279 (1973).

[2] W. Neuhauser, M. Hohenstatt, and P. E. Toschek, Phys. Rev. **A22**, 1137 (1980).

[3] W. Paul and M. Raether, Z. Phys. **140**, 262 (1955).

[4] W. Paul, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 531 (1990).

[5] A. L. Migdall, J. V. Prodan, W. D. Phillips, T. H. Bergeman, and H. J. Metcalf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 2596 (1985).

[6] M. B. Mensky, "Continuous Quantum Measurements and Path Integrals", (IOP, Bristol and Philadelphia, 1993).

[7] R. P. Feynman, Rev. Mod. Phys. **20**, 367 (1948).

[8] M. B. Mensky, Phys. Rev. **D20**, 384 (1979).

[9] M. B. Mensky, The Path Group: Measurements, Fields, Particles (Nauka, Moscow, 1983).

[10] M. B. Mensky, Ann. Phys., Lpz. **45**, 215 (1988); H. H. von Borzeszkowski and M. B. Mensky, Phys. Lett. **A188**, 249 (1994).

[11] A. Camacho, in preparation.

[12] M. Mensky, Class. Quantum Grav. **7**, 2317 (1990); A. Camacho, in preparation.

[13] J. Audretsch and M. Mensky, Phys. Rev **A56**, 44 (1997); J. Audretsch, M. Mensky and V. Namiot, Phys. Lett. A **237**, 1 (1997).

[14] G. Blanch, in “Handbook of Mathematical Functions”, M. Abramowitz and I. Stegun eds. (Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1972).

[15] W. Dittrich and M. Reuter, “Classical and Quantum Dynamics” (Springer, Berlin, 1996).

[16] M. Mensky, Sov. Phys. JETP **50**, 667 (1979).

[17] H. Dehmelt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 525 (1990).

[18] M. Mensky, private communication.